

Contents

<i>List of figures</i>	xi
<i>List of tables</i>	xii
<i>Acknowledgement</i>	xiii
 Introduction	 1
<i>Reconceptualising State obligations to do no (further) harm to unaccompanied child asylum seekers</i>	4
<i>Notes</i>	8
 1 The historical context of Australia's treatment of asylum seekers, including unaccompanied child asylum seekers	 12
<i>Notes</i>	18
 2 Comprehending the specific vulnerability of unaccompanied child asylum seekers	 23
2.1 <i>Introduction</i>	23
2.2 <i>The global context</i>	24
2.3 <i>Comprehending unaccompanied children's specific vulnerability</i>	24
2.3.1 <i>Acknowledging resilience</i>	24
2.3.2 <i>The vulnerability of unaccompanied child asylum seekers: the triple burden</i>	25
2.3.3 <i>Minority</i>	26
2.3.4 <i>Alienage</i>	29
2.3.5 <i>Family separation</i>	31
2.4 <i>Conclusion</i>	34
<i>Notes</i>	34

3	The unfulfilled potential of human rights for unaccompanied child asylum seekers	41
3.1	<i>Introduction</i>	41
3.2	<i>State legal obligations towards unaccompanied child asylum seekers in international human rights law</i>	41
3.3	<i>Correlating States' human rights obligations with the triple burdens of vulnerability of unaccompanied child asylum seekers</i>	45
3.3.1	<i>Human rights law and children's minority</i>	47
3.3.2	<i>Human rights law and children's alienage</i>	50
3.3.3	<i>Human rights law and unaccompanied children's separation from their parents</i>	53
3.4	<i>The failure to implement human rights protections in practice: Australia as a case study</i>	56
3.4.1	<i>The persistence of the practice of onshore mandatory immigration detention and offshore immigration detention, despite repeated findings of the harm immigration detention inflicts on children</i>	57
3.4.2	<i>Return to offshore processing and Boat Turnbacks and Takebacks in 2012–2014</i>	58
3.4.3	<i>The subordination of the Minister's guardianship obligations in the IGO Act to his border control functions in the Migration Act</i>	59
3.5	<i>Conclusion</i>	60
	<i>Notes</i>	61
4	The potential of expanding vulnerability theory to prioritise State responses to unaccompanied asylum-seeking children	70
4.1	<i>Introduction</i>	70
4.2	<i>The conceptual foundations of vulnerability theory</i>	71
4.3	<i>Expanding vulnerability theory beyond the citizen insider to encompass unaccompanied child asylum seekers: the proximate vulnerable child</i>	75
4.4	<i>Determining what constitutes a mitigating vulnerability framework</i>	77
4.4.1	<i>Distinguishing between multiple vulnerabilities</i>	78
4.4.2	<i>Prioritising redress</i>	80
4.4.3	<i>Determining the requisite mitigating vulnerability response of the State to these children</i>	82
4.5	<i>Conclusion</i>	83
	<i>Notes</i>	84

5 Vulnerability analysis of provision of care to unaccompanied asylum-seeking children, using Australia as a case study	88
5.1 <i>Introduction</i>	88
5.2 <i>Operation of the 2012–2014 legislative amendments: environments of care based on the date of arrival, not on care and protection needs</i>	89
5.3 <i>Impact of Australia’s punitive environments of care</i>	90
5.3.1 <i>Impacts on the Legacy Caseload cohort (unaccompanied asylum seeker children on the Australian mainland)</i>	91
5.3.2 <i>Impacts on the Offshore Transferee cohort (unaccompanied asylum seeker children ‘cared for’ on Nauru)</i>	95
5.4 <i>Priorities for reform</i>	103
<i>Notes</i>	105
 6 Vulnerability analysis of Australia’s processing of asylum claims of unaccompanied children	 114
6.1 <i>Introduction</i>	114
6.2 <i>Operation of the 2012–2014 legislative amendments: downgrading unaccompanied children’s ability to seek asylum in Australia</i>	115
6.3 <i>Impact of denying access to RSD and protections against refoulement: augmenting the protection gap for unaccompanied child asylum seekers</i>	117
6.3.1 <i>Impacts on the Legacy Caseload cohort eligible for processing of their asylum claim on the Australian mainland</i>	119
6.3.2 <i>Impacts on the Offshore Transferee cohort</i>	121
6.3.3 <i>Impacts on the Boat Turnbacks and Takebacks cohort (unaccompanied asylum seeker children subject to Boat Turnbacks and Takebacks)</i>	124
6.4 <i>Priorities for reform</i>	126
<i>Notes</i>	128
 7 Vulnerability analysis of Australia’s provision of guardianship to unaccompanied asylum-seeking children	 133
7.1 <i>Introduction</i>	133
7.2 <i>Operation of the 2012–2014 legislative amendments: cementing the Minister responsible for border protection as the inherently conflicted guardian</i>	134

7.3	<i>Impact of the changes: the guardian gatekeeper vacated the space</i>	139
7.3.1	<i>Guardianship of unaccompanied asylum seeker children in the Legacy Caseload cohort on the Australian mainland</i>	140
7.3.2	<i>Guardianship of unaccompanied asylum seekers in the Offshore Transferee cohort</i>	141
7.3.3	<i>Guardianship of unaccompanied asylum seeker children in the Boat Turnbacks and Takebacks cohort</i>	142
7.4	<i>Priorities for reform</i>	142
	<i>Notes</i>	147

8	Scope to expand the application of the mitigating vulnerability framework to other contexts	152
----------	--	------------

8.1	<i>Prising open space to respond to unaccompanied child asylum seekers</i>	152
8.2	<i>The acute vulnerability of unaccompanied child asylum seekers</i>	154
8.3	<i>Human rights compliance as the long game</i>	155
8.4	<i>The novelty of an expanded vulnerability theory in identifying the content of, and prioritising the rollout of, an acute response</i>	157
8.5	<i>Roadmap for reform</i>	158
8.6	<i>The utility of the mitigating vulnerability framework in other contexts</i>	160
	<i>Notes</i>	161

	<i>Bibliography</i>	163
	<i>Index</i>	188